



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/628,799 | 07/28/2003 | Markus Hamulski | HAMULSKI AL-5 | 4531 |
| 25889 | 7590 | 04/18/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| WILLIAM COLLARD COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576 | | | ZIRKER, DANIEL R | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1771 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,799

Applicant(s)

HAMULSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Zirker

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/26/04, 7/28/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit 1771

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because although the disclosure does teach the use of polyisobutylene as an adhesive suitable for use in the claimed surface protection film, it appears much more accurate to state that the adhesive layer is formed from a blend of at least one styrene block copolymer and at least one polyolefin, as applicants' amended independent claim now states. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. It is suggested in line with the above comment that applicants' amended claims should be amended in the last line by putting after "and" inserting the phrase --at least one polyolefin-- in place of the now existing "polyolefins".

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

4. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth

in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EPA 0661364A2. Note particularly the Abstract, page 2, lines 12-28, page 3, lines 5-10, lines 32-35, page 4, lines 16-25, line 35 - page 5 line 36, page 6 lines 6-10, lines 17-23, Example 6, Table 1, Examples 7-14, claims 1, 8-10. The reference discloses, in certain embodiments, a surface protective film comprising a base layer film whose composition can comprise a polyolefin and additionally features an adhesive layer that can be comprised of a blend of at least one α -olefin of 2 to 12 carbon atoms and which also comprises at least one block copolymer such as an SEBS or SIS block copolymer (e.g. the Examples), which is substantially all applicants' independent claim and dependent claim 2 requires. With respect to the dependent claims, the amount of di-block copolymer content as set forth in claims 3 and 4 is believed to be, if not inherent, at most an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill, as is the performance parameter regarding adhesive strength set forth in

Art Unit 1771

claim 5, and the fact that since the reference teaches only up to 10% crystallinity for the polyolefin means that the remainder is amorphous (claim 7). Finally, bonding layers, i.e. primer layers (claim 9) are disclosed, as is the thickness layer range of claim 10.

7. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EPA -364. The reference is again relied upon substantially as set forth above, with the presence of the release layer composition set forth in claims 11-12 believed to be clearly conventional in the adhesive sheet art, as is the use of microembossed surfaces set forth in claim 13, in the absence of unexpected results not heretofore set forth on the record.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note also Matsui et al. and Ko et al.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is (571) 272-1486. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for this Group

Serial No. 10/628,799

-5-

Art Unit 1771

is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dzirker:cdc

April 14, 2005

DANIEL ZIRKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Daniel Zinker